

**REMARKS**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation Examiner Nguyen's courtesy in conducting the July 13, 2006 personal interview. During the interview, Applicants' representatives and Examiner Nguyen discussed the rejection of claims 1-6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants' representatives and Examiner Nguyen also discussed a proposed claim amendment which adds the step of passing the product from the treating steps to the corresponding gas turbine system. The differences in the claims of the present Amendment and those of the July 13 draft were suggested by Examiner Nguyen, to recite the gas turbine positively.

Applicants respectfully request that the Information Disclosure Statement originally submitted on November 19, 2003, and resubmitted on August 17, 2005, be acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1 and 16 have been amended. Claims 9-15 have been canceled. Claims 7 and 8 were previously canceled. Claims 1-6 and 16 are pending in this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in this and other applications.

The title has been amended to more closely conform with the scope of the claims. The specification has been amended to correct typographical and translation errors.

Claims 1-6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The limitation "in the absence of a reaction accelerator" has been removed from claims 1 and 16 to facilitate further prosecution of this application. As amended, claims 1-6 and 16 are in

compliance with 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants request this rejection as to claims 1-6 and 16 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCollum et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,948,755) ("McCollum") in view of Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,733,259) ("Wilson"). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

McCullom describes a process for recovering and upgrading hydrocarbons from oil shale and tar sands by contacting the oil shale and tar sands with a dense-water-containing fluid, in the presence of a catalyst. Wilson describes the removal of asphaltenes and metals from heavy petroleum oils by dispersing the oil in steam.

Claims 1 and 16 recite, *inter alia*, a "method of operating a gas turbine" comprising "providing a heavy oil" which contains vanadium and/or sulfur, "reacting said heavy oil with water" which is heated to 300°C to 500°C and pressured to 10 MPa to 30 MPa and then scavenging the vanadium and/or sulfur thereby "producing a reformed oil," and "supplying said reformed oil to said gas turbine."

Neither McCullom nor Wilson discloses or suggests reforming the oil for use in a gas turbine. The heat of the exhaust gas from the gas turbine would be available for heating and pressuring the water of the invention. Accordingly, this increases the working efficiency of the system. Additionally, the oil to be reformed in each of the cited references, such as oil containing 25-275 ppm of vanadium (McCollum Table 9) or 215 ppm of vanadium (Wilson Table I), has a lower quality than the oil in the present invention (see, e.g., page 10, lines 3-13). Even the reformed oil of the cited references such as oil containing on the order of at least 10 ppm of vanadium (McCollum Table 11) or 139 ppm of vanadium (Wilson Table II), is not of a high enough quality for use with

a gas turbine. Therefore, the cited references cannot suggest or disclose the claimed limitation of using the reformed oil in a gas turbine.

Additionally, the use of the word "eliminate" in the claims suggests that the concentration of the vanadium and/or sulfur in the reformed oil is very low. In context, "eliminate" does not mean the ideal state of complete removal of these impurities, however, it does connote a very low concentration of vanadium and/or sulfur remains in the reformed oil. The systems of the cited prior art references cannot be said to have "eliminated" the vanadium and/or sulfur as the term is used in the claims.

Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 16 are allowable over the cited combination. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 1-6 and 16.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,733,259) ("Wilson"). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Wilson relates to the removal of asphaltenes and metals from heavy petroleum oils by dispersing the oil in steam. As previously discussed, Wilson does not disclose or suggest reforming the oil for use in a gas turbine, as is required by amended claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, claims 1 and 16 should be allowable over the cited art. Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1 and should be allowable as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3-6 and 16 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Jennifer M. McCue

Registration No.: 55,440

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant